



6-22-07

AF
JAW



COX SMITH MATTHEWS
INCORPORATED

ATTORNEYS + COUNSELORS

COURT B. ALLEN
DIRECT: 210.554.5389
EMAIL: cballen@coxsmith.com

REGISTERED PATENT ATTORNEY

June 20, 2007

Mail Stop APPEAL BRIEF-PATENTS
Commissioner for Patents
P. O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Re: United States Patent Application
Serial No.: 10/060,027
Title: Business Method for Memorializing Vehicle Purchase Transactions
Our Reference No.: 30457.36

Dear Sir or Madam:

Enclosed please find the following documents for filing with the above referenced U.S. Patent Application:

1. Reply Brief in triplicate (3 pages each); and
2. Acknowledgment Post Card.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any required fee for this submission to Deposit Account No. 03-3483.

Respectfully submitted,

Court B. Allen

Courtenay B. Allen
Reg. No. 43,469

CBA:lah
Enclosures

cc: Mr. Bob Corbin (w/ encl.)
Mr. Matt Nowicki (w/ encl.)
Mr. Matthew Jennings [Firm] (w/o encl.)

EXPRESS MAIL "Post Office to Addressee" Mailing Label
No.: EV 417533680 US
Date of Deposit: June 20, 2007



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

IN RE APPLICATION OF:
**Gerald Lacour, Garrett Lacour, Robert
Corbin, and Matt Nowicki**

SERIAL NO. 10/060,027

FILED: January 28, 2002

TITLE: **BUSINESS METHOD FOR
MEMORIALIZING VEHICLE
PURCHASE TRANSACTIONS**

§ ATTORNEY DKT. NO. 30457.36
§
§
§ GROUP ART UNIT: 3627
§
§
§ EXAMINING ATTORNEY: Michael Cuff
§
§
§

MAIL STOP APPEAL BRIEF-PATENTS
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

REPLY BRIEF

Applicant files this Reply Brief to the Examiner's Answer of April 20, 2007, in accordance with the provisions of 37 C.F.R. § 1.193 for the reason that the Examiner's Answer erroneously states that **Haber et al.** contains a "computer-searchable identifier" as required by independent Claim 7 of the present application.

The aforementioned error arises in the following sentences constituting the final paragraph of page 4 of the Examiner's Answer:

"[Applicant's Appeal Brief] asserts that Haber et al. does not show a computer-searchable identifier. The Examiner does not concur. The searchable identifier is the time data and the catenate certificate number."

As noted on page 7 of Applicant's Appeal Brief filed January 12, 2007, in which the **Haber et al.** reference is discussed in detail, **Haber, et al.** merely discloses a method of authenticating the date on which a particular document is transmitted to a third-party, namely an

“outside time-stamping agency (TSA),” by creating a catenate value. “The resulting catenate value is then included with time and other identifying data in a document, now a certificate of the temporal existence of the original document, which is transmitted back to the author where it will be held for later use in any required proof of such existence.” **Haber et al.** at col. 3, lines 21-27. In other words, the “time and other identifying data in a document” described by **Haber et al.** refers to data relating to the time stamping of the secondary document that is created and sent to the author, and not to the *underlying content* of the original document, as recited in Applicant’s claim 7 (namely, “a computer-searchable identifier *of said digital, audio-visual record*”). The author of the media at issue in **Haber et al.** receives a singular, encrypted certificate or receipt for each document submitted to the TSA. This receipt merely notes the date on which the document was submitted by the third-party user of the TSA. Although that receipt may be computer searchable, a computer-searchable identifier of a user’s submission of a document is completely different from “a computer-searchable identifier *of said digital, audio-visual record*,” as recited by Claim 7 (emphasis added). Indeed, a review of the specification makes clear that the computer-searchable identifiers claimed in claim 7 are those which describe or relate to the actual content of the underlying digital, audio-visual record. For example, the specification lists several exemplary content-related identifiers, such as “the customer’s name, address, vehicle purchased, time, date, etc. for cataloging the to-be-generated audio/visual record of the transaction.” *Application* at Page 8, lines 1-3. Thus, for example, practitioners of the claimed method could “search for all transactions on a particular date, by a certain sales staff member, involving a particular vehicle or product.” *Id.* at Page 9, lines 2-5. **Haber, et al.** does not disclose or suggest any such computer-searchable identifier of the content of the digital audio-visual record as claimed by Applicant.

In regards to the other arguments listed in the Examiner’s Answer, Applicant hereby reiterates its disagreement and maintains the arguments originally made of record in Applicant’s Appeal Brief. For the foregoing reasons, Applicant believes that the Examiner’s rejections of

Claims 7 – 10 were erroneous, and reversal of his decision and allowance of those claims are respectfully requested.

Entry of this Reply Brief is earnestly solicited. No fee is believed to be required for this Reply Brief according to 37 C.F.R. § 1.193. This Reply Brief does not include any new or non-admitted amendment, or any new or non-admitted affidavit or other evidence pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 41.41.

Respectfully submitted,

COX SMITH MATTHEWS INCORPORATED

Date: 6-20-2007

By: Court B Allen

Courtenay B. Allen

Reg. No. 43,469

112 E. Pecan St., Suite 1800

San Antonio, Texas 78205

(210) 554-5389

(210) 226-8395 (Fax)

ATTORNEYS FOR APPLICANT

EXPRESS MAIL "Post Office to Addressee" Mailing Label No.: <u>EV 417533680 US</u> Date of Deposit: <u>June 20, 2007</u>
